

REMARKS

Claims 13, 26, 27 and 28-have been amended, new claims 29-33 have been added and claim 23 has been canceled. Thus, claims 13-21, 24-33 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 112:

Claims 13, 16, and 17 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112 first paragraph.

Applicant's claims 13 and 28, as amended, recite:

at least one of the external gateways exclud[ing] a user interface

Paragraph 10 recites "Each gateway provides access to a communications network and does not necessarily have to have a user interface". Furthermore, Figure 1 depicts gateways 23a and 23b which are car transceivers without a user interface. Moreover, Applicant has amended the Specification to recite "In one aspect, at least one of the external gateways has no internal selection means, call signaling means, input means and output means". One skilled in the art would recognize that an input means and an output means are types of user interfaces. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification provides sufficient support for the amendments to claim 13 and 28.

The Examiner rejects claims 16 and 17 for including the term "only" stating that the terminal should display only the gateways which are really important for the user". Applicant respectfully submits that a selection unit is used to select an external gateway in order to establish the telecommunication connection to the respective communications network via the selected gateway. Furthermore, Paragraph 34 recites "A typical sequence in the use of this system by the user assumed here (father of the family) is approximately as follows: he is at home in the attic and sees on the display of his agent 3a that he can accept calls and conduct outgoing calls via the analog fixed-network PSTN and via the gateway 23a of his company car 21a which is standing in front of the house. He sees that both his wife's car and her agent are not displayed, that she has therefore left the house in her car:" Thus, only gateways that are in the range of the local-area transceiver may be used for a connection and only the gateways that may be used for

the connection are displayed for selection of an external gateway in order to establish the connection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification provides sufficient support for claims 16 and 17.

Applicant's claims 26 and 28, as amended, recite:

an internal gateway for connecting to a mobile radio
communications network

Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is supported in the Specification (see e.g., paragraph 11).

Applicant's claim 27, as amended, recites:

the internal gateway acts as an external gateway to a further
telecommunications terminal.

Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is supported in the Specification (see e.g., paragraph 10).

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 13-18, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious in view of Kotzin (US PG Pub 2004/0204076) over Herring (USPN 7,177,287). Claims 19-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious in view of Kotzin over Pradhan et al. (USPN 6,968,178). Claims 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious in view of Kotzin over Herring and Wilcock et al. (USPN 6,741,864).

Claims 13 and 28 recite:

at least one of the external gateways exclud[ing] a user interface

The Examiner states that “Herring teaches a telecommunications terminal ... wherein at least one of the external gateways having at least one of the characteristics of excluding an input device or excluding a display device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Kotzin with the teaching of Herring in order to provide cost efficient access points for the mobile terminals”.

However, Kotzin invention relates to enhancement of the user interface by the gateway. The combination of Kotzin with Herring would mean the terminal would communicate with a gateway that does not have a user interface. This combination therefore would not provide an enhancement to the user interface as sought by Kotzin. Thus, there would be no motivation to make such combination.

In view of the above, independent claims 13 and 28 are patentable. Furthermore, Claims 14-18, and 24-26 which depend on claim 13 are also patentable at least based on their dependency as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

Claim 19 recites:

each local-area transceiver for a plurality of the telecommunication terminals are configured for directly exchanging voice traffic with each other without the intermediate connection of an external network.

The Examiner states that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Kotzin with the teaching of Pradhan in order to provide free short range connection and cost efficient methods for communication”.

However, Kotzin invention relates to enhancement of the user interface by the gateway. The combination of Kotzin with Herring for a direct communication between terminals, both of which have limited user interfaces, would not provide a user interface enhancement. Thus, there would be no motivation to make such combination.

In view of the above, independent claims 19 is patentable. Furthermore, Claims 21 and 27 which depend on claim 19 are also patentable at least based on their dependency as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

New Claims 29-33:

New claims further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings.

Conclusion

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 05-07-2008

By: Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830